Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The assignment of dates to different parts of the city is based, of course, on the supposition that the dates on the lintels and stelæ refer to the time of building, and, furthermore, "on the supposition that the Ben-Ik symbol in connection with a Katun has the value 13, and that the long buildings may in some cases have been built in parts at different times."

Indeed the only point in this paper that is not made quite clear is the reason for assigning the value 13 to the Ben-Ik symbol, but it is gratifying that we are given reason to expect a full discussion of this very interesting question in another paper. The notes conclude with a tabular view of the dates both in relation to the separate inscriptions and to the structures. G.

A Suggestive Maya Inscription. By CHARLES P. BOWDITCH. Cambridge, Mass., 1903. Privately printed. 8°, 20 pp.

In the book of *Chilan Balam* of Tizimin, and again in the book of *Chilan Balam* of Chumayel, it is stated that in a certain Katun 13 Ahau "Pop was set in order." This somewhat obscure statement has been a source of much difficulty to students of Maya history and tradition. Pop being the first month of the year, it could mean only one thing, viz., that something was done to the calendar at that time. Brinton was of opinion that it referred to the invention of chronological records, but it is much more probable that the allusion was to some correction that was made in the annual calendar. In 1901 Mr Bowditch expressed the opinion that the change hinted at consisted simply in bringing the beginning of the year into its proper relation with the seasons, and that the relation of the annual calendar to the long count was not affected. Mr Bowditch is now persuaded not only that the proof of this is available but that he has been able to identify the very inscription in which the adjustment referred to in the books of *Chilan Balam* is commemorated. This inscription, which forms the subject of the paper under review, is one of special interest. It is one of the few inscriptions that have come from Tikal, a city that has been very imperfectly explored, and in which no initial series has as yet been found.

The traditions of the Mayas were to the effect that their ancestors came from the west, and Mr Bowditch, arguing from the dates found in the different cities, thinks that their course was from the west and south, one branch settling at Copan while another pushed on to the Usumacinta valley. Toward the end of Cycle 9 both these branches moved northward, founding Seibal, Tikal, Bacalar, and Chichen-Itza at successive stages of their migration. The date 10. 0. 0. 0. 0 is found at Seibal, while at Chichen-Itza the only known date is 10. 2. 9. 1. 9. Therefore, Mr Bowditch argues, if a date were found at Tikal, it should be between these two dates. In fact, the Tikal inscription begins with the date 3 Ahau 3 Mol, which may be 10. 0. 15. 8. 0. Afterward comes the number 2. 11. 12 and the date 6 Eb 0 Pop, which would then be 10. 0. 18. 1. 12.

In an earlier paper Mr Bowditch attempted to demonstrate the likelihood of an agreement between the dates on the monuments of the different cities and the records of the books of *Chilan Balam*. Following the same line of argument he is led to look on the Tikal tablet for some indication of a correction in the calendar.

Unfortunately we are not clearly told anywhere what method was used by the Mayas for making the year and the seasons correspond, and there is disagreement with regard to the method used by the Mexicans. Leon y Gama, however, states that the Mexicans added 25 days every 104 years. If the Mayas used this method and if they had neglected from the beginning to apply it to the adjustment of the calendar, and if the date 6 Eb. 0 Pop given in the inscription is 10. 0. 18. 1. 12, = 1,446,512 days = 3,963 years = 38 × 104 years + 11 years, and if 1 day was allowed for each four years of the odd years, then when they reached the date given in the inscription the Mayas would have just exactly 952 days to allow in order to make the calendar correspond to the seasons. This is the number recorded in the inscription (glyphs 4 and 5) where 2. 11. 12 are noted. By counting back 952 days from 6 Eb. 0 Pop, therefore, to 3 Ahau 3 Mol and proceeding from that date, the Mayas would, on reaching 6 Eb. 0 Pop again, find the beginning of the year in its proper place. Thus we find in the inscription the date 6 Eb. 0 Pop, the 952 days and the date 3 Ahau 3 Mol. In glyph 13 one day is added, bringing the count to 7 Ben 1 Pop.

Mr Bowditch expresses the opinion that the Mayas actually made the correction in the manner indicated, and he shows further that about this time was a period of peculiar interest for the Mayas because they had just passed a day that represented the completion not only of an exact number of years of 365 days but also an exact number of synodical revolutions of the planet Venus, understood by the Mayas as a period of 584 days (Dresden Codex, 46–50). "It would be wise therefore to look for a rectification of the Venus revolutions as well as for a rectification of the calendar, especially as in glyph 16 we find the Venus Symbol. . . . The synodical revolution of Venus is really 583.92 days or $\frac{8}{100}$ of a day less than 584 days. Not having a decimal system the Mayas would be likely to express such a quantity as a fraction with 1 for a numerator. As a matter of fact $\frac{1}{12}$ of a day is a very close approximation to $\frac{8}{100}$, and it would be natural for them to have decided that the correction should be made at the rate of one day in each twelve Venus revolutions.''

It is found by calculation that on the day 7 Ben 1 Pop, noted above, 2,478 revolutions and 520 days had passed, and so 64 days more are required to make an exact number of revolutions. This would bring the count to a day 6 Caban, and we find 6 Caban in glyph 17. On that day just 2,479 Venus revolutions would have been completed.

From his observations Mr Bowditch thus reaches the important conclusions that we have learned how the Mayas compensated for the error in the 365-day year, and that they not only made this correction at Tikal but that they corrected at the same time their observations of the synodical revolution of Venus.

The correspondence of numbers and dates in the Tikal inscription is certainly remarkable, to say the least. The careful work and accurate methods of the author make the paper one of substantial value that will be read with interest and profit by all students of the Maya inscriptions. The objection that will be raised is that there is no distinct indication that the date found in the inscription is really that proposed by Mr Bowditch. Further exploration at Tikal may settle definitely the question of dates.

Not the least valuable part of the paper is the suggestion on the last page concerning the use of the table on page 24 of the Dresden Codex. We are shown, by means of an example, how the quantities in that table might have been applied by the Mayas to the solution of such a mathematical problem as is presented by the inscription of Tikal. G.

Divisions of the Parietal Bones in Man and other Mammals. By ALEŠ HRDLIČKA. Author's Edition, extracted from Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. XIX, Article VIII, pp. 231–386. New York, July 11, 1903.

This well-printed monograph, with 19 plates, 39 text figures, exhaustive tabular statements, bibliography (pp. 382–386), and alphabetical index of authors, is a model of detailed scientific observation and description. After résuméing (pp. 232–254) the work of previous investigators, Dr Hrdlička gives the results of his own examination of "nearly 3,000 Indian and 400 white and negro crania; a little over 400 skulls of apes and monkeys; and a little over 2,000 skulls of other mammals.'' Divisions of the parietal bone are rare in man, comparatively frequent in